

Message

From: Bacey, Juanita@DTSC [Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov]
Sent: 10/16/2017 6:12:13 PM
To: LEE, LILY [LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Subject: RE: FYI - Sent to Navy/City - FW: Updated summary of Trench Unit scores as of this morning 10 am + 3 more concluded

There are no fill unit forms to review. After the last update to the Trench Unit spreadsheet, all fill units were covered (though some by a 1). We just need to confirm that TU sampling means sampling not only the sidewalls and bottom, but the interior fill material as well. If in the end, if we decide that a 1 score does not need to be resampled, then there are only 6 forms that need to be reviewed (67,68,71,78,79,107). I can take a look at those today if you like?

-----Original Message-----

From: LEE, LILY [mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Sent: Monday, October 16, 2017 11:04 AM
To: Bacey, Juanita@DTSC <Juanita.Bacey@dtsc.ca.gov>
Subject: FW: FYI - Sent to Navy/City - FW: Updated summary of Trench Unit scores as of this morning 10 am + 3 more concluded

Does this reduce the number of fill units left to review?

-----Original Message-----

From: LEE, LILY
Sent: Monday, October 16, 2017 10:56 AM
To: 'Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO' <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>
Cc: Brooks, George P CIV <george.brooks@navy.mil>; Amy Brownell (amy.brownell@sfdph.org) <amy.brownell@sfdph.org>
Subject: Updated summary of Trench Unit scores as of this morning 10 am + 3 more concluded

Here is this morning's update summary. Out of 43 NFA, 35 concluded, 8 left to go. . .

-----Original Message-----

From: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO [mailto:derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil]
Sent: Monday, October 16, 2017 8:20 AM
To: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>
Cc: Brooks, George P CIV <george.brooks@navy.mil>
Subject: RE: 1 corrections + summary - RE: EPA draft review of Parcel G Trench Units in Radiological Data Evaluation Findings Report

Hi Lily,

Thank you for sending your evaluation of Parcel G. I have two questions...

1. What does the "EPA Score 1 = Need further review" mean? Is this just a place holder for outstanding DTSC/CDPH review? Or are you saying that EPA needs to review this further?
2. I assume that we will be getting a similar spreadsheet for Parcel B. Any idea of when that will be transmitted?

Thanks again,

Derek

-----Original Message-----

From: LEE, LILY [mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Sent: Sunday, October 15, 2017 11:30 PM
To: Brooks, George P CIV
Cc: Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Macchiarella, Thomas L JR CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO; Edwards, Zachary L CIV SEA 04 04N; Slack, Matthew L CIV SEA 04 04N; Henderson, Kim/SDO; Hay Scott; kira.sykes@ch2m.com; juanita.bacey@dtsc.ca.gov; Singh, Sheetal (CDPH-EMB); Jue, Tracy (CDPH-EMB); Amy Brownell (amy.brownell@sfdph.org); Bob Burns <reburns@ngtsinc.com> (reburns@ngtsinc.com); Christina Rain; Karla Brasaemle (kbrasaemle@techlawinc.com); Kappelman, David; jdawson@techlawinc.com; donna.j.getty; Chesnutt, John; Fairbanks, Brianna; Janda, Danielle L CIV
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] 1 corrections + summary - RE: EPA draft review of Parcel G Trench Units in Radiological Data Evaluation Findings Report

Dear Pat,

I apologize that I noticed one correction is needed: TU 101's overall score was left blank in the previous version, but it should have been a 2. Attached is a corrected version. In addition, for your convenience I have added a summary table as the sheet in the 2nd tab of this revised workbook.

Lily

From: LEE, LILY
Sent: Friday, October 13, 2017 10:59 PM
To: 'Brooks, George P CIV' <george.brooks@navy.mil>
Cc: 'Robinson, Derek J CIV NAVFAC HQ, BRAC PMO' <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>;
'thomas.macchiarella@navy.mil' <thomas.macchiarella@navy.mil>; Edwards, Zachary L CIV SEA 04 04N
<zachary.edwards@navy.mil>; 'Slack, Matthew L CIV SEA 04 04N' <matthew.slack@navy.mil>; 'Henderson,
Kim/SDO' <Kimberly.Henderson@CH2M.com>; Scott Hay (SHAY@CABRERASERVICES.COM) <SHAY@CABRERASERVICES.COM>;
'kira.sykes@ch2m.com' <kira.sykes@ch2m.com>; 'juanita.bacey@dtsc.ca.gov' <juanita.bacey@dtsc.ca.gov>;
'sheetal.singh@cdph.ca.gov' <sheetal.singh@cdph.ca.gov>; 'tracy.jue@cdph.ca.gov' <tracy.jue@cdph.ca.gov>;
Amy Brownell (amy.brownell@sfdph.org) <amy.brownell@sfdph.org>; Bob Burns <reburns@ngtsinc.com>
(reburns@ngtsinc.com) <reburns@ngtsinc.com>; 'Christina Rain' <crain@Langan.com>; Karla Brasaemle
(kbrasaemle@techlawinc.com) <kbrasaemle@techlawinc.com>; David Kappelman (Kappelman.David@epa.gov)
<Kappelman.David@epa.gov>; 'jdawson@techlawinc.com' <jdawson@techlawinc.com>; Getty, Donna J.
<Donna.J.Getty@leidos.com>; Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>; Fairbanks, Brianna
<fairbanks.brianna@epa.gov>; 'Janda, Danielle L CIV' <danielle.janda@navy.mil>
Subject: EPA draft review of Parcel G Trench Units in Radiological Data Evaluation Findings Report

Dear Pat,

Thank you for providing for review the draft Radiological Data Evaluation Findings Report for Parcels B and G Soil, Former Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, San Francisco, California, September 2017. I appreciate that it represents a great deal of hard work. The City has told us its priority is Parcel G, so we started with that before reviewing Parcel B. Thomas stated that the Navy's priority is to get an indication of which locations are higher vs. lower priority for resampling. As I promised last Thursday, attached is an early indication of prioritization. This draft spreadsheet for trench units in Parcel G shows observations we have noted thus far. The second column with an "overall score" indicates the following determinations:

* 2 = Sufficient evidence has already been found in the form, the FRED database, and/or other sources to conclude the resampling is necessary in this trench unit before EPA can conclude that the record supports that the ROD requirements have been met.

* 1 = More review is needed before EPA can conclude whether more resampling is necessary. More review may include, for example, further statistical tests to be run and completed soon.

* 0 = No indications have been found thus far for particular concerns in this trench unit. However, as the Navy wrote in Section 1.3 of this draft report, "Because it is impossible to determine whether every instance of potential data manipulation or falsification has been identified, the Navy recommends additional surveys and sampling beyond the areas with evidence of data manipulation. Additional soil sampling locations will be selected in coordination with the regulatory agencies." (Section 1.3, p. 1-2)

For now, EPA plans to prioritize fill units for resampling in correspondence with the priority of the source trench units for resampling. We will update the attached spreadsheet and submit other comments as our review continues. A more formal and thorough set of written comments will come later. Please contact me at any time at 415-947-4187 if you would like to discuss these draft comments further.

Lily

Lily Lee

Cleanup Project Manager

Superfund Division

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9

75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3)

San Francisco, CA 94105

Tel: 415-947-4187, Fax: 415-947-3518

For information on Superfund in general: www.epa.gov/region9/superfund
<<http://www.epa.gov/region9/superfund>>

For information on Hunters Point Naval Shipyard: www.epa.gov/superfund/hunterspoint
<<http://www.epa.gov/superfund/hunterspoint>>